

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLIC                     | ATION NO. | FI                                  | LING DATE  | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/820,672                 |           | 03/30/2001                          |            | Michael P. Dallmeyer | 051252-5189         | 4276             |
| 962                        | 9         | 7590                                | 06/23/2004 |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP |           |                                     |            |                      | KIM, PAUL D         |                  |
|                            |           | SYLVANIA AVENUE NW<br>CON, DC 20004 |            |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                            |           | ,                                   |            |                      | 2700                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   | <b>"</b>                      |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| Advisory Action  | 09/820,672   | DALLMEYER ET AL.   |                               |
| ,  | Examiner   | Art Unit   | •                             |
|  | Paul D Kim   | 3729   |                               |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence address  |                               |
| THE REPLY FILED 26 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIST THE THEORY IN THE PLACE THIST THEORY IN THE PLACE THIST THEORY IN THE PLACE THIST THEORY IN THE PLACE THE PLACE THEORY IN THE PLACE THE P | oid abandonment of this application at the same of this application and the same of the sa | ation. A proper reply to<br>h places the application   | in                            |
|  | EPLY [check either a) or b)]   |  |                               |
| a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).   | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing   | g date of the final rejection.   |                               |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C  | of extension and the corresponding amough<br>the shortened statutory period for reply<br>be later than three months after the mail   | ount of the fee. The appropriation or the final Office or the fina | ite extension<br>e action; or |
| <ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>15 March 2004</u>. App<br/>37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF</li> </ol>  | •  | •  |                               |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be  | ecause:  |  |                               |
| (a)  they raise new issues that would require further  | er consideration and/or search (s  | see NOTE below);   |                               |
| (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b  | elow);   |  |                               |
| (c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir<br>issues for appeal; and/or  | n better form for appeal by mate   | rially reducing or simplif   | ying the                      |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancelli NOTE:  | ng a corresponding number of fi  | nally rejected claims.   |                               |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject   | ion(s):  |  |                               |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  | be allowable if submitted in a se  | parate, timely filed ame   | endment                       |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See   |  | dered but does NOT pla   | ace the                       |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  | ause it is not directed SOLELY t   | o issues which were ne   | wly                           |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we   |  |  | an                            |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |  |  |                               |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |  |  |                               |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |  |  |                               |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-24</u> .   | •  |  |                               |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |  |  |                               |
| 8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appr  | oved or b) disapproved by the  | he Examiner.   |                               |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen   | nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)   | -1/1/  | 2                             |
| 10. Other:   |  | A. DEXTER TUGBAN<br>PRIMARY EXAMINE  |                               |
|  |  |  |                               |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the prior art of record fails to dislose the claimed invention such as an assembling a fuel group by performing in the order of sequential steps. Applicant indicated that the reference of Dallmeyer states at col. 8 that the assembling steps of the fuel group are not in the order as the claimed invention. Examiner respectively traverses the argument. The assembling steps of the fuel group of Dallmeyer at col. 8 do not describe a sequential order (such as using a word of "before" and/or "thereafter") for assembling the fuel group. Exmainer read the steps of Dallmeyer that the numbering of the assembling steps at col. 8 does not mean for the sequential order. Accordingly, Dallmeyer disloses all of the steps at col. 8 as recited steps in each of claims 1 and 10.